1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
3	
4	HAROLD D. HARDEN,) Case No. 2:15-cv-01168-RFB-CWH
5	Plaintiff,)
6	v.)
7	HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON, et al, ORDER
8	Defendant.
9)
10	Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to reconsider (ECF No. #159), filed on
11	November 8, 2016. Defendants have not filed a response.
12	Plaintiff moves the Court to reconsider its order issued on November 2, 2016 (ECF No. 157),
13	which denied a number of motions in this case (ECF Nos. 84, 86, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 138, 143, and
14	148), and granted two motions (ECF Nos. 136 and 139). Although motions for reconsideration are
15	disfavored, the Court may reconsider an order upon a showing that (1) there is newly discovered
16	evidence that was not available when the original motion or response was filed, (2) the court
17	committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening
18	change in controlling law. Local Rule 59-1(a). A motion for reconsideration must not repeat
19	arguments already presented except to the extent necessary to explain relevant law or facts. Local
20	Rule 59-1(b).
21	Here, construing the motion liberally, Plaintiff argues that the Court's order was in error and
22	unjust. However, Plaintiff merely repeats arguments made in the motions the Court considered in its
23	order. The Court has considered these arguments and was not persuaded. Plaintiff does not present
24	any new evidence, or any intervening change in controlling law. The Court therefore finds no cause
25	to reconsider its order.
26	
27	
28	1

	Case 2:15-cv-01168-RFB-CWH Document 180 Filed 03/08/17 Page 2 of 2
1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 159) i
2	DENIED.
3	
4	DATED: March 6, 2017.
5	Carolt
6	C.W. Hoffman, Jr. United States Magistrate Judge
7	United States Magistrate Judge
8	
9	
1011	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	